

REMARKS

In an office action dated May 7, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for lack of antecedent basis of the term "user." Applicant's representative did not write the current application or current claims, and mistakenly assumed that claims 3 and 4 depended through claim 2 on claim 1. However, as pointed out by the Examiner in an office action dated June 9, 2007, the 35 U.S.C. § 112 is entirely justified, since claim 2 is independent, and does not include the term "user." The purpose of the above amendment is to introduce the phrase "a user" into claim 2 in order to address the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections of claims 3 and 4. In the office action dated June 9, 2007, claim 5 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, but no explanation for the rejection is given.

In Applicant's representative's opinion, all of the claims remaining in the current application are clearly allowable. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Mark E. Phillips et al.  
Olympic Patent Works PLLC

  
Robert W. Bergstrom  
Registration No. 39,906

Olympic Patent Works <sup>PLLC</sup>  
P.O. Box 4277  
Seattle, WA 98194-0277  
206.621.1933 telephone  
206.621.5302 fax